

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated October 4, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Also, Applicants thank the Examiner for the Interview conducted on December 20, 2006.

Claims 1 and 9 are hereby amended. Claims 1, 3–9, and 11–12 are currently pending, with claims 5–8 being withdrawn from consideration. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,726,802 to Ono et al. (hereinafter “Ono”); and claims 3 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ono.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ono. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 was canceled in a previous amendment. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of independent claim 1 and request reconsideration. Independent claim 1, as amended, is allowable in that it recites “the lower storage electrode divides the pixel region into two substantially equal sub-regions.” As discussed in the interview conducted on December 20, 2006, nothing in Ono teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, and its dependent claims 2 and 4, are allowable over Ono.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of independent claim 9 and request reconsideration. Independent claim 9, as amended, is allowable in that it recites “the lower storage electrode,” that “divides the pixel region into two substantially equal sub-regions.” As discussed in the interview conducted on December 20, 2006, nothing in Ono teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 9, and its dependent claim 12, are allowable over Ono.

In the Office Action, claims 3 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ono. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 3 and request reconsideration. Claim 3, which depends from independent claim 1, is allowable because Ono does not teach or suggest the above-cited feature of independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 3, as it depends from independent claim 1, is allowable over Ono.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 11 and request reconsideration. Claim 11, which depends from independent claim 9, is allowable because Ono does not teach or suggest the above-cited feature of independent claim 9. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11, as it depends from independent claim 9, is allowable over Ono.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: January 3, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By



Eric J. Nuss

Registration No.: 40,106

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant